UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/318,105	05/24/1999	EMMANUEL GERLOVIN	PAS-094	9928

959 7590 04/08/2004

LAHIVE & COCKFIELD, LLP.
28 STATE STREET
BOSTON, MA 02109

EXAMINER	
DAY, HERNG DER	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2128	16

DATE MAILED: 04/08/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/318,105	GERLOVIN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Herng-der Day	2128	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *28 October 2003 and 27 January 2004*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-26* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-26* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *28 October 2003* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This communication is in response to Applicants' Amendment (paper # 11) to Office Action dated July 28, 2003 (paper # 10), mailed October 28, 2003, and Response (paper # 15) to Office Action dated November 12, 2003 (paper # 12), faxed January 27, 2004.

1-1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicants' submission filed on October 28, 2003, has been entered.

1-2. Claims 1, 8, 15, 19, and 24 have been amended; claims 1-26 are pending.

1-3. Claims 1-26 have been examined and rejected.

Drawings

2. The proposed drawing corrections to Fig. 5 and Fig. 9 received by PTO on October 28, 2003, have been approved. Two replacement drawings are acceptable. The objection to the drawings has been withdrawn.

Specification

3. The Examiner requests detailed information about the earlier version of Pro/ENGINEER 2000i package, i.e., Pro/ENGINEER package released before Pro/ENGINEER 2000i. In paper #

9, Applicants submitted Pro/Engineer 2000i material. However, earlier versions, as required in paper # 8, have not been found.

4. Applicants have amended claim 8. The objection to the specification in section 5 of paper # 10 has been withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

5. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

6. Claims 1-14 and 19-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

6-1. The amended independent claims 1, 8, and 19 recite the newly added limitation "programmatically" in each claim respectively. It does not appear to have support in the original disclosure.

6-2. Claims 2-7, 9-14, and 20-23 are rejected as being dependent on the corresponding rejected claim.

Double Patenting

7. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or

improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970);and, *In re Thorington,* 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

7-1. Claims 1, 8, and 24 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 7, 14, 18-19, 23, 27, and 30-32 of copending Application No. 09/316,549. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because they are all directed to using external application program to provide output data to a CAD package.

7-2. This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

8. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

9. Claims 1-2, 5-8, 11-14, 19-20, and 23-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Deitz, "Design Optimization", Mechanical Engineering, October 1998, Vol. 120, Issue 10, page 24.

9-1. Regarding claim 1, Deitz discloses a computer system running a computer-aided design (CAD) package (Mechanical Desktop computer-aided-design program from Autodesk Inc., page 24, column 1, paragraph 3) and an external application program (EAP) (version 2.0 of MSC/InCheck, page 24, column 1, paragraph 3), a method, comprising the steps of:

providing a model of an object in the CAD package, wherein said model includes output data from the EAP integrated into said model (Mechanical Desktop solid model, page 24, column 1, paragraph 4);

modifying the model (vary specified dimensions, page 24, column 1, paragraph 4);

determining that the modifying of the model requires recalculation of the output data from the EAP (run a simulation to produce an optimum design, page 24, column 1, paragraph 4); and

in response to the determining, sending new input data to the EAP and obtaining new output data from the EAP (produce an optimum design, page 24, column 1, paragraph 4).

9-2. Regarding claim 2, Deitz further discloses a step of calling the EAP from the CAD package to obtain the new output data (perform ... simulations from within the Mechanical Desktop computer-aided-design program, page 24, column 1, paragraph 3).

9-3. Regarding claim 5, Deitz further discloses that the EAP performs analysis (optimization process, page 24, column 1, paragraph 4) on at least a portion of the model to produce the original output data and the new output data (updates the geometry of the Mechanical Desktop solid model, page 24, column 1, paragraph 4).

9-4. Regarding claim 6, Deitz further discloses that the analysis is an engineering analysis (optimization process, page 24, column 1, paragraph 4).

9-5. Regarding claim 7, Deitz further discloses a method comprises the steps of:

further modifying the model (vary specified dimensions, page 24, column 1, paragraph 4);

determining that the further modifying of the model requires further recalculation of the output data from the EAP (run a simulation, page 24, column 1, paragraph 4); and

in response to the determining that the further modifying of the model requires further recalculation of the output data, obtaining new output data from the EAP (produce an optimum design, page 24, column 1, paragraph 4).

9-6. Regarding claim 8, Deitz discloses a computer system having a computer-aided design (CAD) package (Mechanical Desktop computer-aided-design program from Autodesk Inc., page 24, column 1, paragraph 3) for manipulating a model of an object, a method, comprising the steps of:

exporting data from a CAD model in a CAD program to an external application program (EAP) (vary specified dimensions and run a simulation to produce an optimum design, page 24, column 1, paragraph 4);

using the exported data as input data to execute the EAP (run a simulation, page 24, column 1, paragraph 4) and obtain output data from the EAP (produce an optimum design, page 24, column 1, paragraph 4);

importing the output data into the CAD program from the EAP; integrating the output data into the CAD model such that future changes to the model require additional calculations to be performed by the EAP (updates the geometry of the Mechanical Desktop solid model, page 24, column 1, paragraph 4);

modifying the CAD model so that the input data to the EAP changes to new input data (vary specified dimensions, page 24, column 1, paragraph 4);

updating the output data by calling the EAP without user input and passing the new input data to the EAP following the modification of said model (vary specified dimensions and run a simulation to produce an optimum design, page 24, column 1, paragraph 4); and

automatically integrating the updated output data into the CAD model without a user request (automatically updates the geometry of the Mechanical Desktop solid model, page 24, column 1, paragraph 4).

9-7. Regarding claim 11, Deitz further discloses that the CAD model is a feature-based model (Mechanical Desktop, page 24, column 1, paragraph 3; a well-known feature-based parametric solid modeler).

9-8. Regarding claim 12, Deitz further discloses that the CAD model is a parametric model (Mechanical Desktop, page 24, column 1, paragraph 3; a well-known feature-based parametric solid modeler).

9-9. Regarding claim 13, Deitz further discloses that said integrating the output data into the CAD model comprises adding parameters to the CAD model (adding parameters to the CAD model is inherent during developing the Mechanical Desktop solid model).

9-10. Regarding claim 14, Deitz further discloses that said integrating the output data into the CAD model comprises adding geometric entities to the CAD model (adding geometric entities to the CAD model is inherent during developing the Mechanical Desktop solid model).

9-11. Regarding claim 19, Deitz discloses a computer system running an external application program (EAP), and a computer-aided design (CAD) package with a model of an object that includes output data from the EAP, a computer-readable medium holding computer-executable instructions for performing a method, comprising the computer-implemented steps of:

modifying the model (vary specified dimensions, page 24, column 1, paragraph 4);

determining that the modifying of the model requires recalculation of the output data from the EAP (run a simulation to produce an optimum design, page 24, column 1, paragraph 4); and

in response to the determining, sending new input data to the EAP and obtaining new output data from the EAP (produce an optimum design, page 24, column 1, paragraph 4).

9-12. Regarding claim 20, Deitz further discloses a step of calling the EAP from the CAD package to obtain the new output data (perform ... simulations from within the Mechanical Desktop computer-aided-design program, page 24, column 1, paragraph 3).

9-13. Regarding claim 23, Deitz further discloses that the EAP performs analysis (optimization process, page 24, column 1, paragraph 4) on at least a portion of the model to produce the output data and the new output data (updates the geometry of the Mechanical Desktop solid model, page 24, column 1, paragraph 4).

9-14. Regarding claim 24, Deitz discloses a computer system having a computer-aided design (CAD) package for manipulating a model of an object, a computer-readable medium holding computer-executable instructions for performing a method, comprising the computer-implemented steps of:

importing output data into the CAD program (Mechanical Desktop computer-aided-design program from Autodesk Inc., page 24, column 1, paragraph 3) from an external application program (EAP) (version 2.0 of MSC/InCheck, page 24, column 1, paragraph 3);

integrating the output data into the model such that future changes to the model require additional calculations to be performed by the EAP (updates the geometry of the Mechanical Desktop solid model, page 24, column 1, paragraph 4);

modifying the model so as to require updating of the output data (vary specified dimensions, page 24, column 1, paragraph 4); and

automatically updating the output data by calling the EAP with new input data without a user request (automatically updates the geometry of the Mechanical Desktop solid model, page 24, column 1, paragraph 4).

9-15. Regarding claim 25, Deitz further discloses that the model is feature-based (Mechanical Desktop, page 24, column 1, paragraph 3; a well-known feature-based parametric solid modeler).

9-16. Regarding claim 26, Deitz further discloses that the model is parametric (Mechanical Desktop, page 24, column 1, paragraph 3; a well-known feature-based parametric solid modeler).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

10. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

11. Claims 3-4, 9-10, 15-18, and 21-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Deitz, "Design Optimization", Mechanical Engineering, October 1998, Vol. 120, Issue 10, page 24, in view of Cottrell et al., "CHDStd - A Model for Deep Submicron Design Tools", Design Automation Conference 1998, Proceedings of the ASP-DAC 1998, Asia and South Pacific, pages 249-255.

11-1. Regarding claim 3, Deitz discloses MSC/InCheck performing simulations from within the Mechanical Desktop computer-aided-design program (page 24, column 1, paragraph 3) but fails to explicitly disclose the step of registering the MSC/InCheck with the Mechanical Desktop CAD package. However, Cottrell et al. teach a callback feature that allows an application to register methods to be invoked on specific object events. Callback registration includes the function to be called and optional application-data to be passed (page 252, column 1, paragraph 5). With a callback, program code can be easily modularized to take advantage of this event-driven processing (page 252, column 1, paragraph 6).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to register the EAP with the CAD package to establish a link from the Mechanical Desktop to the MSC/InCheck because program code can be easily modularized to take advantage of this event-driven processing as suggested by Cottrell et al. (page 252, column 1, paragraph 6).

11-2. Regarding claim 4, Deitz discloses MSC/InCheck performing simulations from within the Mechanical Desktop computer-aided-design program (page 24, column 1, paragraph 3) but fails to explicitly disclose the registration of a callback to the EAP from the CAD package, i.e., the registration of a callback to the MSC/InCheck from the Mechanical Desktop CAD package. However, Cottrell et al. teach a callback feature that allows an application to register methods to be invoked on specific object events. Callbacks can be registered for add, delete, or modify events, for example, setting a particular property value, on many objects (page 252, column 1, paragraph 5). With a callback, program code can be easily modularized to take advantage of this event-driven processing (page 252, column 1, paragraph 6).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to register a callback to the EAP from the CAD package to establish a link from the Mechanical Desktop to the MSC/InCheck because program code can be easily modularized to take advantage of this event-driven processing as suggested by Cottrell et al. (page 252, column 1, paragraph 6).

11-3. Regarding claim 9, Deitz discloses MSC/InCheck performing simulations from within the Mechanical Desktop computer-aided-design program (page 24, column 1, paragraph 3) but fails to explicitly disclose the step of registering the MSC/InCheck with the Mechanical Desktop CAD package. However, Cottrell et al. teach a callback feature that allows an application to

register methods to be invoked on specific object events. Callback registration includes the function to be called and optional application-data to be passed (page 252, column 1, paragraph 5). With a callback, program code can be easily modularized to take advantage of this event-driven processing (page 252, column 1, paragraph 6).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to register the EAP with the CAD package to establish a link from the Mechanical Desktop to the MSC/InCheck because program code can be easily modularized to take advantage of this event-driven processing as suggested by Cottrell et al. (page 252, column 1, paragraph 6).

11-4. Regarding claim 10, Deitz discloses MSC/InCheck performing simulations from within the Mechanical Desktop computer-aided-design program (page 24, column 1, paragraph 3) but fails to explicitly disclose the registration of a callback that is called from the CAD program to access the EAP, i.e., the registration of a callback that is called from the Mechanical Desktop CAD package to access the MSC/InCheck. However, Cottrell et al. teach a callback feature that allows an application to register methods to be invoked on specific object events. Callbacks can be registered for add, delete, or modify events, for example, setting a particular property value, on many objects (page 252, column 1, paragraph 5). With a callback, program code can be easily modularized to take advantage of this event-driven processing (page 252, column 1, paragraph 6).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to register a callback that is called from the CAD program to access the EAP to establish a link from the Mechanical Desktop to access the MSC/InCheck because program code

can be easily modularized to take advantage of this event-driven processing as suggested by Cottrell et al. (page 252, column 1, paragraph 6).

11-5. Regarding claims 15 and 16, Deitz discloses a computer-aided design (CAD) system, comprising:

a CAD program (Mechanical Desktop computer-aided-design program from Autodesk Inc., page 24, column 1, paragraph 3);

an external application program (EAP) that is external to the CAD program (version 2.0 of MSC/InCheck, page 24, column 1, paragraph 3);

a model of an object that contains output data from the EAP integrated into the model such that future changes to the model require additional calculations to be performed by the EAP (updates the geometry of the Mechanical Desktop solid model, page 24, column 1, paragraph 4); and

Deitz does not explicitly disclose a registration facility. However, Cottrell et al. teach a callback feature that allows an application to register methods to be invoked on specific object events. Callbacks can be registered for add, delete, or modify events, for example, setting a particular property value, on many objects (page 252, column 1, paragraph 5). With a callback, program code can be easily modularized to take advantage of this event-driven processing (page 252, column 1, paragraph 6).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Deitz to incorporate the teachings of Cottrell et al. to obtain the invention as specified in claims 15 and 16 because with registering a callback, program code

can be easily modularized to take advantage of this event-driven processing (page 252, column 1, paragraph 6).

11-6. Regarding claim 17, Deitz further discloses that the model is a feature-based model (Mechanical Desktop, page 24, column 1, paragraph 3; a well-known feature-based parametric solid modeler).

11-7. Regarding claim 18, Deitz further discloses that the model is a parametric model (Mechanical Desktop, page 24, column 1, paragraph 3; a well-known feature-based parametric solid modeler).

11-8. Regarding claim 21, Deitz discloses MSC/InCheck performing simulations from within the Mechanical Desktop computer-aided-design program (page 24, column 1, paragraph 3) but fails to explicitly disclose the step of registering the MSC/InCheck with the Mechanical Desktop CAD package, i.e., registering the EAP with the CAD package. However, Cottrell et al. teach a callback feature that allows an application to register methods to be invoked on specific object events. Callback registration includes the function to be called and optional application-data to be passed (page 252, column 1, paragraph 5). With a callback, program code can be easily modularized to take advantage of an event-driven processing (page 252, column 1, paragraph 6).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to register the EAP with the CAD package to establish a link from the Mechanical Desktop to the MSC/InCheck because program code can be easily modularized to take advantage of an event-driven processing as suggested by Cottrell et al. (page 252, column 1, paragraph 6).

11-9. Regarding claim 22, Deitz discloses MSC/InCheck performing simulations from within the Mechanical Desktop computer-aided-design program (page 24, column 1, paragraph 3) but

fails to explicitly disclose the registration of a callback to the EAP from the CAD package, i.e., the registration of a callback to the MSC/InCheck from the Mechanical Desktop CAD package. However, Cottrell et al. teach a callback feature that allows an application to register methods to be invoked on specific object events. Callbacks can be registered for add, delete, or modify events, for example, setting a particular property value, on many objects (page 252, column 1, paragraph 5). With a callback, program code can be easily modularized to take advantage of this event-driven processing (page 252, column 1, paragraph 6).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to register a callback to the EAP from the CAD package to establish a link from the Mechanical Desktop to the MSC/InCheck because program code can be easily modularized to take advantage of this event-driven processing as suggested by Cottrell et al. (page 252, column 1, paragraph 6).

Applicants' Arguments

12. Applicants argue the following:

12-1. Response to the Advisory Action

(1) "Support for the term "programmatically" can be found throughout the original specification" (page 2, paper # 15).

(2) "If the CAD program is initiating an action automatically without user intervention, the action is happening "programmatically"" (page 2, paper # 15).

12-2. Claim Rejections Pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §112

(3) "Applicants have amended claim 8 (upon which claims 9-14 are dependent) to remove the limitation" (page 7, paper # 11).

12-3. Claim Rejections Pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §102(a)

(4) Fane fails to anticipate the claimed invention (pages 7-10, paper # 11).

12-4. Claim Rejections Pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

(5) "the teachings of Fane do not include all of the elements of the underlying independent claims" (page 11, paper # 11).

(6) "Fane fails to disclose the integration of the EAP output data into the model such that future changes to the model require additional calculations to be performed by the EAP. Cottrell et al also lacks these limitations" (page 11, paper # 11).

Response to Arguments

13. Applicants' arguments have been fully considered. They are not persuasive except for argument (2).

13-1. Applicants' arguments (1) - (2) are not persuasive. Applicants define how an action is happening "programmatically" in argument (2), which does not appear to have support in the original disclosure and, therefore, is an addition to the original disclosure.

Please see section 2163.02 of the MPEP, Standard for Determining Compliance With the Written Description Requirement, "The subject matter of the claim need not be described literally (i.e., using the same terms or in haec verba) in order for the disclosure to satisfy the description requirement. If a claim is amended to include subject matter, limitations, or terminology not present in the application as filed, involving a departure from, addition to, or

deletion from the disclosure of the application as filed, the examiner should conclude that the claimed subject matter is not described in that application. This conclusion will result in the rejection of the claims affected under 35 U.S.C.112, first paragraph - description requirement, or denial of the benefit of the filing date of a previously filed application, as appropriate."

13-2. Applicants' argument (3) is persuasive. The original claim rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, have been withdrawn.

13-3. Applicants' argument (4) with respect to claims 1-2, 5-8, 11-14, 19-20, and 23-26 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. Claims 1-2, 5-8, 11-14, 19-20, and 23-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as detailed in sections **9** to **9-16** above.

13-4. Applicants' arguments (5) - (6) with respect to claims 3-4, 9-10, 15-18, and 21-22 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. Claims 3-4, 9-10, 15-18, and 21-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as detailed in sections **11** to **11-9** above.

Conclusion

14. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to Applicant's disclosure.

Reference to Gladwin et al., "Introduction to ProcessModel and ProcessModel 9000", Proceedings of the 1997 Winter Simulation Conference, December 1997, pages 594-600, is cited as disclosing a bi-directional communication between two applications through OLE automation.

15. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Examiner should be directed to Herng-der Day whose telephone number is (703) 305-5269. The Examiner can normally be reached on 9:00 – 17:00.

If attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, Kevin J Teska can be reached on (703) 305-9704. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Herng-der Day
March 30, 2004

HUGH JONES Ph.D.
PRIMARY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100